UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,033	03/12/2004	Ivan W. Pulleyn	29795/10000A	6705

21912 7590 01/09/2006

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. FOOTHILL BLVD #200
CUPERTINO, CA 95014

EXAMINER	
LIN, KENNY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 01/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/799,033	PULLEYN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kenny Lin	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 October 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *13-23,36-46 and 59-96* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *13-23,36-46 and 59-96* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/7/05*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 13-23, 36-46, 59-96 are presented for examination. Claims 1-12, 24-35 and 47-58 are canceled.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The information disclosure statement filed 4/7/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 13-18, 36-41, 59-64, 70-71, 74, 77, 79-80, 83, 86, 88-89, 92 and 95 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema, WO 99/27680, in view of Stedman et al (Stedman), US 6,262,726.

5. Huitema was cited in the previous office action.

6. As per claims 13, 36 and 59, Huitema taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of providing an IP address for a host in a computer network, the method comprising the steps of:

a. A processor (computer is inherent to comprise processors) configured to: receiving at an appliance a request for an IP address associated with a domain name from a client in a computer network (page 1, lines 19-21, 26-40, page 2, lines 5-6; receiving at local server);

b. Retrieving the requested IP address from a database associated with the appliance (page 1, lines 28-33, page 2, lines 5-8, 20; local cache);

c. Transmitting the retrieved IP address to the client (page 2, lines 5-8); and

d. Wherein the appliance includes a processor configured to run an operating system that is optimized to provide a network name-related functionality (page 1, lines 28-33; local server inherently includes a processor and operating system);

e. A memory coupled with the processor, wherein the memory provides the processor with instructions (local computer is known to comprises memory to providing instructions).

7. Huitema did not specifically teach to omit from the operating system at least one software component that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality. Stedman taught to customized operating system by only installing the selected components (col.3, lines 26-29, col.4, lines 24-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Stedman because Stedman's teaching of customized installation enables Huitema's method to remove unwanted programs from installation and allow a generic installation operating program to be placed on every computer system (see Stedman, col.4, lines 24-39).

8. As per claims 14, 37 and 60, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught the step of establishing communicative coupling between a client web browser and the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29).

9. As per claims 15-17, 38-40 and 61-63, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that wherein the computer network comprises the Internet, an IP based computer network and an intranet (300, fig.3, page 1, lines 19-21, page 4, lines 13-17).

10. As per claims 18, 41 and 64, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance receives the request (fig.1, page 1, lines 28-29, page 4, lines 13-19).

11. As per claims 70, 79 and 88, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Stedman further taught that the operating system is derived from a full operating system that includes the at least one software component (col.3, lines 21-37, col.4, lines 24-27, 45-49).

12. As per claims 71, 80 and 89, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Stedman further taught that the at least one software component includes one of the following: a driver or a utility software (col.3, lines 31-37, col.4, lines 24-31).

13. As per claims 74, 83 and 92, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the network name-related functionality comprises the DNS and the IP address comprises a requested IP address associated with a host identified in a DNS request received at the appliance (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2, lines 5-14).

14. As per claims 77, 86 and 95, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught that the appliance includes a DNS server, a configuration server, a web server, a database, and/or a GUI (page 1, lines 24-40, page 2, lines 5-14).

15. Claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Stedman as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Frank et al (hereinafter Frank), US 6,832,120.

16. Frank was cited in the previous office action.

17. As per claims 19-23, 42-46 and 65-69, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Stedman did not specifically teach the system to further linking a host object with a network object and a zone object, the zone object is linked to another zone object, the network object is linked to another network object, unlinking an old network object from a host object; deleting the old network object; and linking the host object to a new network object and automatically updating the host object to reflect an association with the new network object. Frank taught that custom objects can be programmed and linked together to support applications (col.2, lines 6-15) and the links can be deleted, added or reconfigured in real time (col.5, lines 54-59). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Stedman and Frank because Frank's teaching of creating custom objects and linking objects enables Huitema and Stedman's system to use custom objects to support system applications.

18. Claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Stedman as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of "Official Notice".

19. As per claims 72-73, 81-82 and 90-91, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Stedman further taught to customized hardware components (col.3, lines 7-18). Huitema and Stedman did not specifically teach the appliance

excludes a hardware component/communication port that typically is included in a host computing system but that is not required to provide the network name-related functionality. Official Notice is taken that the concept and advantage of eliminating or uninstalling unused hardware component on a computer is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema and Stedman and further assemble a host computer with only the needed components to reduce the cost of the system and further simplify the installations.

20. Claims 75-76, 84-85 and 93-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Stedman as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Boden et al (hereinafter Boden), US 6,832,322.

21. Boden was cited in the previous office action.

22. As per claims 75, 84 and 93, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Stedman did not specifically teach to provide an interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Stedman and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Stedman's system to access

and configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden, col.7, lines 19-20).

23. As per claims 76, 85 and 94, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema further taught to user client web browser to send request to the appliance (page 1, lines 26-29). Huitema and Stedman did not specifically teach to provide a web interface for configuring the appliance. Boden taught to configure a DNS server system using a graphical user interface (col.7, lines 19-35, 43-47). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Stedman and Boden because the Boden's teachings of using graphical user interface for controlling and configuring the DNS server enables Huitema and Stedman's system to access and configure the remote DNS servers to avoid redundant copies of information contained (Boden, col.7, lines 19-20).

24. Claims 78, 87 and 96 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema and Stedman as applied to claims 13, 36 and 59 above, and further in view of Belzile, US 6,801,952.

25. Belzile was cited in the previous office action.

26. As per claims 78, 87 and 96, Huitema and Stedman taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 13, 36 and 59. Huitema and Stedman did not specifically teach that the

database is an object oriented database. Belzile taught to store IP address in object oriented database (col.5, lines 32-43). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Huitema, Stedman and Belzile and use an object oriented database as the database disclosed in Huitema and Stedman's system to store and retrieve IP address.

Conclusion

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

28. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

29. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-3968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tue.-Fri. and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ksl
December 27, 2005

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100